



From: Sir Jeffrey Jowell QC and Lady Jowell

To: Rachel.english@camden.gov.uk

Re: 4B Hampstead Hill Gardens. Planning Application no. 2019/5835/P

Dear Ms English

We reside opposite the site at the above address and have done so since 1984.

We should stress that, despite the inconvenience that any works on this site would cause us, during and after demolition, we would never be opposed to a reasonable development that conforms to the distinctive architectural and environmental qualities of this part of the street (and that fits with the national and local policies governing this Conservation Area). We have, however, reluctantly come to the view that this application would by no means preserve or enhance these qualities, but would significantly damage them.

As you will know, the houses that immediately surround the site are almost all Batterbury and Huxley Queen Anne style, Grade II listed buildings, with which any new development must blend.

It is true that both 4A and 4B, do not conform to that unique architectural style. However, they do not appear in the Conservation Area Statement of buildings which detract from the area and which would benefit from enhancement (see also Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan Annex 2). This is no doubt due to the fact that any difference between 4A and 4B and the nearby houses is minimized by their relative modesty and unobtrusiveness, being secluded by foliage and set-back. The two houses also carefully and intentionally blend in terms of height and appearance.

In contrast, the proposed development seeks to impose itself somewhat aggressively, separating itself architecturally from 4A, to which it is attached, and which it will so powerfully dominate, thus creating a lopsided effect.

Once it is so separated it will also be out of harmony with the character of its immediate surroundings, breaking the rhythm of the townscape by virtue of its materials (especially the metal cladding on the roof area and aluminium windows) and design (including the two Juliet balconies overlooking the street at different angles). It makes some concessions to the prevailing red brick of the

Queen Anne houses but, overall, far from preserving and enhancing the character of the area, it will contribute negatively to it and clash with the local vernacular.

There are of course further arguments against this proposal on the grounds of overlooking and loss of privacy, excess bulk and density, loss of unique views and daylight, possible loss of parking space and the grave inconvenience to 4A, which shares a party wall with 4B. I am sure all these issues were clear to you during your site visit and have been put in writing by others on the street and elsewhere who are so strongly opposed to this development. I shall not repeat these in any detail except to endorse them and, even if some of them are not technically material planning considerations, they together add up to a powerful case that the development will overall adversely affect local amenity.

We are grateful for your process of consultation in relation to this application, and for treating this application as new, especially since the applicant has never shown any willingness to engage with neighbours, apart from merely showing us the plans for his previous application.

In conclusion, we must strongly object to a proposal which, for many reasons, and especially because of the bulk and design of the additional third floor, would forever elicit disbelief that permission could have been given for such a discordant structure.

Yours sincerely

Jeffrey and Frances Jowell